

Having finished first, once again the pattern of inertia in the military decreed that I should become an instructor and that the next sound ranging course that would go through Fort Sill, OK, would be taught by me. This is very flattering, except that my time on active duty with the National Guard would expire before the next class would convene.

I spent the remainder of my time in the day room, or at the post library, or doing other things because there was absolutely nothing for me to do. At the time I wondered: Doesn't anybody review these things? Doesn't anybody look at this and say: Wait a minute, this is a program that has long since outlived its usefulness, should be stopped, and we should just forget this?

No, nobody did. I got so bored, I went in and volunteered to teach other classes and had to go back to school, if you will, on my own time to learn logarithms so that I could teach that mathematical skill to the surveyors in the school. Basically, this was the least distinguished and least significant military career in American history, but it demonstrates what happens when we allow inertia to take over. We allow the military to go forward in one direction, and we do not ever stop and say: Wait a minute, are we doing the right thing?

Summarizing it another way, there are some historians who say the generals always fight the last war; they are always prepared for the last battle, not the battle that is to come.

The cold war is over. That is a cliché. Like most clichés, it happens to be true. Much of our military is geared towards fighting the cold war. Much of our military is geared towards a circumstance where the military commanders involved are comfortable with the way things are going because they are the way things have been.

The idea that there should be a careful look at where they are and a reassessment of the direction they are taking is a little bit threatening; it is unsettling; it implies uncertainty. The one thing many military men hate worse than anything else is uncertainty.

As I was going through the airport, flying back for this week's session, a book caught my eye. Tom Clancy is the author. We all know Tom Clancy. The reason it caught my eye was his mention of a military officer who had helped him write the book, a man named Chuck Horner. I met Chuck Horner when he was the commander of the U.S. Space Command, a four-star general located in Colorado Springs. He was the commander of the air war in the gulf. He was the top Air Force officer with respect to the Gulf War.

I found him fascinating, and when I saw his name on the cover of this book written by Tom Clancy, I decided to buy the book because I wanted to learn more about General Horner.

The reason I found him fascinating, among other things, was this statement he made to me during the time I spent with him. He said: The Gulf War was the first war fought from space. Tanks got positioned by virtue of instructions that came from space. Colin Powell said this is the war where the infantryman goes into the field with a rifle in one hand and a laptop in the other. Even that is now obsolete because he would take a palm pilot instead of a laptop; a laptop would be too cumbersome.

The Army, with its current advertising campaign, is beginning to talk about that. I am not sure it is the right advertising campaign—every soldier is an army of one—but it demonstrates how vastly changed things are.

Against that background where those things not only have changed but are changing, doesn't it make sense for the Secretary of Defense to say it is time for us to pause in the direction we are going in our procurement, in our threat assessment, in our strength establishment, and look toward the kind of military we are going to need in the future? Isn't it time for us to take a break when we do not have an immediate military threat and reassess from top to bottom everything we are doing?

I think it demonstrates the maturity of the Bush administration that Secretary Rumsfeld is engaged in this kind of activity. I think it demonstrates that the Bush administration has a very long-headed view of life; that they are not looking to this week or next week; they are not looking to the current polls; they are not looking to what might work in terms of a special interest group that has an attitude toward the military; they are saying: What does America need for the next decade? What kind of long-term decision can we make that will make America prepare for the different kind of threat we are facing? I think it means a military that will very quickly say we don't need any sound ranging classes, and we don't need any people sitting around with nothing to do. There is far too much to do in terms of planning and training and direction. I applaud President Bush for this decision, I applaud Secretary Rumsfeld for carrying it out, and I wish to make it clear that this Senator will do everything he can to support and sustain this effort.

I yield the floor.

#### RECESS UNTIL 2:15 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 having arrived, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:31 p.m., recessed until 2:14 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. INHOFE).

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 2:45 p.m. shall be under the control of the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, or his designee.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate in morning business for no longer than 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire and Mr. KYL pertaining to the introduction of S. 305 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 3:15 shall be under the control of the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. THOMAS, or his designee.

The Senator from Arizona.

#### NEED FOR MILITARY IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I would like to turn my attention this afternoon to something a little bit more immediate in terms of the Senate's actions. We all saw the news yesterday of the President's visit to Fort Stewart in Georgia. In fact, I spoke with a colleague of ours who had been with the President on that trip. She talked about the rather sorry state of the military barracks she visited, and the need for improvements to the military quality of life all around the country, exemplified by the President's visit to Fort Stewart.

As a result of his visit, the President has made some very forward-leaning announcements about improvement of the quality of life, including \$5.7 billion in new spending—\$1.4 billion for military pay increases, \$400 million to improve military housing, \$3.9 billion to improve military health benefits, \$5.7 billion on new spending for the people in our military. I am certain that part of that will have to come through a so-called supplemental appropriations bill.

For those who are not totally familiar with the work of the Senate, ordinarily at about this time of the year, the Senate has to provide some infusion of cash to the military because of unforeseen expenditures and some that really were not so unforeseen but which were not budgeted for. For example, we know we will have to be in

Bosnia and Kosovo and some other places in the world. Unfortunately, the previous administration never budgeted for those operations in advance, so the military had to pay for those operations out of hide.

They had to not buy certain spare parts, not sail ships during certain hours, not provide for maintenance of facilities and installations, deferring that for a later day, and use the money instead to support these operations abroad. Each year, we have had, therefore, a supplemental appropriations bill. Basically, the bill comes due. It has to be paid one way or another, sooner or later. We will have to do that same thing this year.

The President has decided to wait a little bit to make sure he knows exactly how much is needed. By the way, I hope President Bush will say to the Congress: I found out that we need exactly—and then give us the number. Let's assume it is \$5 billion, for the sake of argument—I would like the Congress to provide \$5 billion in supplemental appropriations to get our military through the end of the fiscal year. That is how much we need, and I will veto a bill that is a dollar less or a dollar more.

In other words, this should not become a Christmas tree for everyone's favorite project. I urge the President to give us an exact figure and tell us it is on our shoulders to pass that supplemental appropriations bill for him, for the military, and to reject any change we may make, therefore, removing the temptation some of our colleagues have to load those bills up with things that don't really pertain to necessities for the military.

I also want to suggest that we are going to need that supplemental appropriations bill not just for the quality of life of our military but for readiness. Certainly, the Presiding Officer knows this better than almost anybody in this body. Readiness has suffered during the last several years through a combination of two primary circumstances. One, we are deploying troops far more frequently and far-flung around the world than in the past. Two, we have cut the spending year after year, so we don't have the equipment in top shape to send where we need to send it, when we need to send it. Our troops are overstressed. The net result is readiness has suffered. We would not be able to go tomorrow where we need to in the world with the same degree of confidence we were able to muster, say, a decade ago when we went to the Persian Gulf.

I think a few statistics are interesting. The lack of spare parts forced our military to cannibalize systems to keep things working. GAO found in 1999, "cannibalization was so widespread in the Air Force that maintenance personnel spent 178,000 hours over 2 years removing parts from

bombers and fighters and transports to put into other planes."

I was at Luke Air Force Base in the western part of the Phoenix area not long ago and was told of the 100-plus planes they had there—roughly 10 percent were F-16s, by the way, the top of our fighter line—were being used for cannibalization. That has gotten some better. That illustrates we are cannibalizing our equipment, and we know that is the beginning of the end, in terms of readiness.

The Navy, the same thing. We could go through all the different services. I won't take the time to do that. These cannibalization rates, not only in the Navy, have doubled in the last 4 years, but the problem is most acute among the jet aircraft that are most in demand.

I think there is a broad consensus that we need to be improving our readiness and that those are bills that need to be paid now, equipment that needs to be purchased now. We can't wait until the beginning of the next fiscal year, which is not until October, this fall sometime. I hope when the President sends his supplemental appropriations request to us, it will include both the personnel quality of life needs he has already announced, which I think all of us will support very strongly, and in addition to that some immediate needs to improve our readiness. I was going to say "ensure" our readiness, but the fact is, we can't do enough in supplemental appropriations to ensure readiness. We can just begin to get to the point where we have the state of readiness we really desire.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Congressional Budget Office, and various independent analysts from groups such as Brookings Institution and the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessment and former Secretaries of Defense, such as Harold Brown and Jim Slessinger—all of these groups and individuals, and many more, have come to the conclusion that we are going to need to increase defense spending over the next several years, and we are going to have to do it fairly dramatically.

I applaud the administration's efforts to examine what we really need, what we can do without, and how we are going to structure our forces to meet the new challenges of the 21st century. It is time to get out of the old thinking and keep putting money into the same old weapons projects.

That said—and we all understand the need for this review—it is also true that at the same time we are doing that review, we can and should be doing things to improve our military, things we know need to be done; and whatever we are going to be doing in 5, 8, 10 years, we know we will need additional funding to support the troops during the next 5, 6, 8, 10 years.

So it is not a matter of either/or, or first we do a review and then decide

how much to spend. We know we need to spend some money now and we also need to reevaluate our long-term strategy so we can better fix our spending for the future.

For those who say we can't do anything until all of that is done, I say listen to those who are expert, who have testified to this in the past, the Joint Chiefs and staff and others, who understand our military requirements right this minute. We are not talking about buying new weapons systems that have to be reevaluated. Let me make it clear that I support President Bush's desire to reevaluate every one of these weapons systems. I have severe doubts about whether some of the most expensive systems we have on the drawing board really need to go forward. But we also know, in the meantime, we do have needs, unmet needs, which can only be satisfied through an increase in defense spending.

That is why I think it is important for us not only to pass the supplemental appropriation at the time the President sends it to us but also to put together very soon a budget for the Department of Defense which meets some of these short-term needs.

Essentially, my bottom line here is the military, the armed services don't have the luxury of waiting until the end of a review to meet some of the needs of today. That is my primary point.

I talked about a dual problem. One problem is the degree of deployment, the number of overseas missions assigned to our military, increased by just under 300 percent during the previous administration, with President Clinton deploying our forces on such missions 40 times compared to 14 times under former President Bush, and 16 times under Reagan. The readiness problems have resulted from that, plus spending not keeping up with the needs.

Just a couple of further illustrations of the problem. A recent article in Defense Week quotes at length from an internal Navy audit into the readiness of F-14 squadrons, which are suffering from this combination of high operational tempos and insufficient funding. One of the quotations from that audit is that, "more and more, forward forces are short on planes, munitions, spare parts, and training time. This could result in F-14 squadrons being at high risk while engaging the enemy, an unnecessary loss of life and property, and failure to achieve U.S. policy goals."

That is pretty serious. When that degree of risk is upon us today, we can't wait until tomorrow to put the funding into the military budget to make up for the shortfall in the short run. We have not budgeted for expenses such as our efforts in the Balkans, as I pointed out before. That ought to be budgeted in the general budget and not have to

come to us each year in a supplemental appropriation.

Unless we are able to infuse this kind of money into the defense budget very quickly, then the Navy is going to be forced to cut its flying hours; the Air Force is going to have to make adjustments that will erode its readiness, including flying hours, maintenance, air crew proficiency, aircraft maintenance and repair, not to mention that spare parts and fuel shortages are going to be required to be rectified if we are going to have a high state of readiness during the interim period between now and the time the new force the Bush administration is talking about comes into play.

Mr. President, there is something else we are going to have to do, and that is to begin doing the kind of research that will be necessary to effectuate President Bush's new plans. He asked for a review of these military programs by experts in the Pentagon and outside who will come to him with some very bold ideas, I predict; and they are going to call for modernization of the force, the use of the most recent technology, the application of that technology in ways that we haven't even dreamed of up until now. But unless we are willing to put money back into research and development, as we used to do, we are not going to be able to effectuate these plans. They are going to look great on paper, but we are not going to have the ability to do it. Why? It takes skilled people in place. Unless these people believe they have a future, they don't sign up for these particular kinds of jobs. The contractors themselves can't wrap up with a group of people and facilities to do something for which there is no contract and no hope of a contract.

You cannot just make this appear out of thin air. That is why we have to begin planning today for the defense budget for this coming fiscal year to begin to reestablish a robust research and development program that will be able to service the budgetary requirements that are going to come from the administration in the creation of its new technological military for the 21st century.

We have been eating our seed corn in this regard over the last several years. Again, the Presiding Officer knows better than most in this body that we have cut research and development way back in order to put some money into quality of life and to keep our forces as ready as we can possibly keep them. The result of that has been to reduce drastically the amount of money available for our research and development.

That is an area where we are going to have to add to the budget that comes before the Congress this year, and if the administration, frankly, is unwilling to do that, then the Congress has to put that money in the budget so when

the President needs those people and those facilities to begin developing these new high-tech products, we will be able to respond to that call.

There are some other areas in which we are going to have to add money to the budget. I spoke this morning with respect to missile defense. It is very clear we are going to be making some decisions early on in this administration to proceed with the development of missile defense. I applaud the administration's desire to reevaluate the exact components and structure of that defense because, frankly, I do not think the way the Clinton administration was thinking about doing it was the best. It was rudimentary; it was vulnerable; it was effective only in an extraordinarily limited sense.

As a first step, it might just be fine, but we are going to have to reevaluate how to put this together and undoubtedly expend funds for research and development, as well as deployment of these systems. That is not going to happen without money in the budget.

When opponents of missile defense say it is going to cost a lot of money, they exaggerate about how much, but they are right about one thing: We are going to have to put more money in the budget for it, more money than has been in the budget in the past. As a result, the budget we put together and send to the President—and I hope the budget the President puts together for our review—will include additional support for ballistic missile defense, especially in an area which has been robbed in the past, and that is the sea-based missile defense.

Mr. President, you may have been one of our colleagues—I believe you were—who supported a lawsuit that I filed against the Secretary of Defense several years ago for refusing to spend money that the Congress authorized and appropriated for specific missile defense programs, specifically, the sea-based systems of the Navy and the THAAD Program of the Army. The Secretary of Defense at that time said: I understand that you have appropriated and authorized this funding, but I am not going to spend the money.

Subsequently, he began to spend a little bit of it. That, plus the fact that money that which had been in those programs was taken from those programs and applied to other programs, has instead resulted in a severe underfunding of these missile defense programs.

These are theater missile defense programs, and the Navy program especially has been robbed and short-changed. Unless we are willing to put money into the budget to ramp those programs back up to where they should be, we are not going to be able to deploy the Navy portion of the missile defense system as we should. The irony is that if we put the money into the budget—and it takes a relatively small

amount; my guess is over 4 years about \$1.5 billion as an add-on will do the trick—if we were to put that kind of money into the budget, we could actually deploy a Navy missile defense system sooner and more effectively than a land-based system. In any event, we have the two to complement each other. The bottom line is we are going to have to put more money into the missile defense part of the budget.

Finally, there has been a suggestion the Department of Energy's defense weapons component of the budget is going to have to take a big hit. That, too, is a big mistake because when the proponents of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty said we really have a substitute for testing, it is called the Stockpile Stewardship Program, I raised several questions. First, we are not going to know for more than a decade whether it is going to produce results.

Second, I predicted Congress' desire to continue funding for this program would wane over time. I have been the second staunchest supporter, by the way, of funding after our colleague, PETE DOMENICI from New Mexico. Sure enough, now there is a suggestion that the Stockpile Stewardship Program should be shorted some funding.

You cannot have it both ways. You cannot argue on the one hand we do not need to do any testing and on the other hand we need to change the Stockpile Stewardship Program.

These are three specific areas I mentioned: the need for research and development, the need for proceeding with the sea-based missile defense system, and the need for stockpile stewardship, all of which are going to require more, not less, funding of the defense budget. That is why at the end of the day, we are going to have to be willing to add money to the defense budget, and if that means it is prior to the administration's determination that funding is necessary, I say so be it; it is going to be necessary. Then we are going to have to get behind the President and support his long-term projects, which I know will, in the end, provide a very robust defense for the United States but which, in the meantime, we are going to have to be very watchful of with respect to the readiness both today and the preparation for that day that the new force of the 21st century has been developed.

These are all matters we will discuss further in the future, but I think they are an important element in discussing this week the President's plan to strengthen our national security to ensure that our military remains the strongest in the world, capable of doing everything we ask of it. I know the President would demand no less.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I know our time is to run until 3:15 p.m. I ask

unanimous consent that I be given 15 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I have been listening with a great deal of interest to you, the Senator from Arizona, as well as the Senator from New Hampshire. I do, as you mentioned, chair the Armed Services Subcommittee on Readiness. The Subcommittee on Readiness has jurisdiction over training, military construction, the BRAC process, and a few other things.

It is important during this debate that we say it in terms of reality to get the attention of the American people. Since 1996, I have been saying that we in the United States of America are in the most threatened position we have been in in the history of this country. Many people do not believe that. Many people shrug their shoulders and say: This is not true, we are the strongest in the world.

Yes, we may be the strongest in the world at this given time, but with the number of threats, it is questionable whether or not we would be able to defend ourselves adequately, certainly not meet the minimum expectations of the American people, which is defend America on two regional fronts.

When I make this statement that we are in the most threatened position—we had before our committee less than a year ago George Tenet, who is the Director of Central Intelligence and the man who knows more about threats than anyone else in this Nation who was, incidentally, appointed by President Clinton. I asked George Tenet that question: Is it true what I have been saying since 1996, that we are in the most threatened position we have been in as a nation? He said: That's exactly right. That is from George Tenet.

The reasons we are are threefold. It has been said on the floor but not put together in one thread.

First of all, the obvious is that we are at one-half the force strength we were in 1991 at the end of the Persian Gulf war. What I am saying is we are one-half the force strength—that can be quantified—one-half the Army divisions, one-half the tactical air wings, one-half the ships.

Talking about ships, we were cut down from a 600-ship Navy to a 300-ship Navy. We saw the tragedy that took place in Yemen with the U.S.S. *Cole*. When you stop and think about it, some of the ships that were taken out when we downsized the Navy were the oilers, the tankers that refuel our ships at sea.

We send our fleets from the Mediterranean, through the Suez Canal, down the Red Sea, turn left and go up the Arabian Sea to the Persian Gulf. That is 5,000 miles. We have to have refueling capacity.

After the Yemen tragedy, I could not find one vice admiral who did not say if

we had not taken out of service at least two of those refuelers, we would have refueled at sea, and those sailors would be alive today. We are at one-half force strength. At the same time, we have more than tripled our number of deployments around the world. I might add, these are places where I contend we don't have national security strategic interests at stake.

In November of 1995, in this Chamber, we were debating whether or not to go into Bosnia. We said on this floor, it is easy to go in; it is hard to get out. We had a resolution of disapproval. It wasn't until President Clinton said: I guarantee if you vote down that resolution of disapproval, we will send the troops over there and they will all be home for Christmas, 1996. Guess what. They are still there.

It will be very difficult to get them out if the same thing happened in Kosovo. Regarding the threat in the Persian Gulf, just to handle the logistics of a war if it should break out in the Persian Gulf, we would have to be 100-percent dependent upon our Guard and Reserve to take care of the defense of this Nation. This is very difficult because the Guard and Reserve components also are down in numbers because of the retention problems we have.

That is serious. When you take that and the number of deployments, along with one-half force strength, the third component is we don't have a national missile defense system. Sometimes, I say it is handy not to be an attorney in this body because when I read the ABM Treaty that was passed, introduced by the Republicans, back in 1972, between two great superpowers, the U.S.S.R. and the United States, I contend that doesn't exist anymore. Yet that is the very thing that has been used for the last 8 years by our previous President to keep us from deploying a national missile defense system.

In 1983, we made the decision we were going to put one into effect. We were online to do that until this last administration came in.

Next, I think it is important to realize this euphoric assumption that many have—and the press does not discourage this notion; it might be our force strength is down, our deployments are up—we don't have a national missile defense system, but there is no threat out there in terms of a national missile defense. Virtually every country out there has weapons of mass destruction. Many countries have missiles that will reach the United States of America.

Take China, for example. If they fired a missile, it would take 35 minutes to get here. We have nothing in our arsenal to stop that missile from hitting an American city. Compare my State of Oklahoma and the terrible disaster, the tragedy that took place. The smallest nuclear warhead known to man is 1,000

times greater in explosive power. Think about that. China has missiles that can reach here. Do other countries besides Russia, North Korea, and China have the missile? We don't know for sure. They are trading technology and trading systems with countries such as Iran and Iraq, Serbia, Libya, Pakistan, and others. The one thing they have in common is they don't like us. We have a serious problem.

We don't have the modernization people think. I heard people say: At least we have the finest equipment in the world.

I was proud of Gen. John Jumper not too many months ago when he came out and said: Right now we don't have anything in our arsenal as powerful in terms of air-to-air combat as the SU-27 and the SU-37. It is my understanding, if we go on with the SU-22, it is not as good as the SU-37 they are building today.

Look at our training and retention. We see our pilots leaving. We see our midlevel NCOs leaving. I talked to pilots at Corpus Navy. Forty pilots said: It is not the competition outside; it is not the money. This country has lost its sense of mission. We are not getting the training we need.

Our Air Force pilots cannot go into the desert and have red flag exercises because we don't have the money to do it. The Senator from Arizona talked about not having bullets, ammunition. We don't have bullets and ammunition. RPM accounts, the maintenance accounts, are supposed to be done immediately.

I was at Fort Bragg the other day in a rainstorm. Our troops were covering up equipment with their bodies because we don't have the money to put a roof on the barracks down there. Our equipment is old. We found some M915 trucks had a million miles on the chassis. They were in bad repair.

We see the cannibalization rate at Travis—C-5s sitting in the field with rotting parts. It is very labor intensive to get the parts back on and to uncrate new parts and replace them. In many areas, our mechanics are actually working 14 to 16 hours a day. Our retention is down.

I can think of nothing more significant at this time than to start doing exactly what our new President said he would do when he was on the campaign trail; that is, assess the problems we have now and how can we put ourselves back into position, where, No. 1, we can adequately protect America from an incoming missile.

As the Senator from Arizona said, we might have tried the same thing with the sea-based AEGIS system. We have \$50 billion invested in 22 AEGIS ships, but they cannot reach the upper tier. It costs little to get them up to knocking down incoming missiles and they can protect the troops in North Korea and both coasts in America. The opportunity is there.

I wish we had proceeded with this 10 years ago. I believe we are on the right step. The single most significant thing we can do as a Senate and Congress and the President of the United States is to rebuild our defense system, to satisfy the minimum expectations of the American people; that is, to defend America on two regional fronts.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. KENNEDY pertaining to the introduction of S. 310 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. DOMENICI pertaining to the introduction of S. 311 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

#### THE RETIRED PAY RESTORATION ACT OF 2001

Mr. REID. Mr. President, each day in America 1,000 World War II veterans die. Seven days a week, every day of every month, thousands of World War II veterans die. It is with this background that today I am going to be talking about legislation which I introduced a short time ago.

On January 24th I sponsored S. 170, the Retired Pay Restoration Act of 2001. This bill addresses a 110-year-old injustice against over 450,000 of our nations veterans. Congress has repeatedly forced the bravest men and women in our nation—retired, career veterans—to essentially forgo receipt of a portion of their retirement pay if they happen to also receive disability pay for an injury that occurred in the line of duty.

We have, in America, a law that says if you are a career military person and you also have a disability you receive while in the military, when you retire you cannot draw both pensions. If you, however, retire from the Department of Energy, or you retire from Sears &

Roebuck, you can draw both pensions, but not our dedicated service men and women. They cannot draw both pensions. That is wrong. That is what this legislation is trying to correct.

The reason I did it on the background of a thousand men dying every day is because we have to do something before it is too late for those people. We have many World War II veterans who spent a career in the military. They were in the military and received a disability. In all of these years, they have only been able to, in effect, draw one pension. That is wrong.

S. 170 permits retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service connected disability to receive military retirement pay while also receiving veterans' disability compensation.

Last year, I along with Senator INOUE, introduced S. 2357, the Armed Forces Concurrent Retirement and Disability Payment Act of 2000. I was extremely disappointed that we did not take the opportunity to correct this long-standing inequity in the 106th Congress.

Out of 100 percent of what we should have done last year, we did 1 percent. We did very little.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. Memorial Day is just over one hundred days away. There is no better honor this body could bestow upon our nations veterans who have sacrificed so much, than to pass this legislation before Memorial Day.

We are currently losing over one thousand WWII veterans each day. Every day we delay acting on this legislation means that we have denied fundamental fairness to thousands of men and women. They will never have the ability to enjoy their two well-deserved entitlements.

Given the tax and budget debate we are now in, I am gravely concerned that we will not have the resources that will be needed to properly fund this legislation and honor those who served our nation—our veterans.

President Bush rightfully this week is focusing attention on the U.S. military. It is very important that he do that. I think the way he is approaching things appears to me to be very reasoned. He is saying we are going to keep Clinton's budget in effect this year until we have a chance to really understand what is happening. But he ordered Secretary Rumsfeld to take a close look at it.

One of the things I want him to take a close look at is not only the readiness of the military and what happens to those people who have already served in the military, but I also say that it is very important that everyone recognize we do need and deserve and will have some kind of a tax cut. But we have to be aware of the fact we are basing these proposed tax cuts on uncertain forecasts. We are forecasting 10 years in the future.

A few days ago here in Washington they forecast morning temperatures in the midforties. Most mornings I get up and take a little run. So I was kind of happy that we were going to have a break in the weather. The forecast was it would be kind of warm. I got up, put on shorts and a T-shirt. Out I went. It was 33 degrees. There is a lot of difference between 40 and 33. I was real cold. I say that because people can't forecast very well the weather 1 day ahead. I think we who are depending on the economists to forecast 10 years ahead must approach this with caution. I know we will do that.

We also have to be sure this tax cut is proper in size. We have to make sure we do not take away from debt reduction and that we take care of Social Security and Medicare.

Also, in addition to these projections, and the size that we are talking about with this tax cut, we want to look at fairness. Are we approaching this in the right way? Is it really appropriate?

This is in the form of a question and not a statement. Is it really appropriate that the top 1 percent and the wealthiest 1 percent get 43 percent of the tax cut? They pay a lot of the taxes—about 20 percent of the taxes. I think there has to be a debate, once we determine the projections, about the size of this tax cut—what we are going to do and how we are going to distribute that?

I was home this past weekend. Most Americans—in fact 80 percent of Americans—pay more in withholding taxes than they do in income taxes.

I also say this: The business community is concerned the tax cuts are not directed toward them but, rather, individuals. We have to make sure the tax cut we come up with is fair. As I said, this Senator supports tax cuts for all Americans. I think we have to make sure these tax cuts protect Social Security and Medicare and that we have some money left over to invest in health, education, and things such as my taking care of veterans.

Of course, for me, the biggest tax cut the American people can get is to recognize if we pay down that debt, everybody gets a tax cut. The magnitude of the tax cut that President Bush is pushing we hope will not eliminate any ability of increased funding for veterans. This is going to cost money, but it is going to cost money that is one of the fairest ways we could spend some of the surplus.

I say to President Bush: We should not leave our veterans behind. I say to Members of this Congress: We should not leave our veterans behind. Our veterans have earned this and now is our chance to honor their service to our Nation in a different way. I will work very hard to ensure that our Nation's veterans receive the dividend of our current surplus. Specifically, we have to have a fiscally responsible tax cut